testimony and presentation slides in connection with their presentation at the hearing by no later than 4:00 p.m. on October 21, 2024. The hearing will be held at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building at 9:30 a.m. on October 22, 2024. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is October 29, 2024. Any person who has not entered an appearance as a party to the investigations may submit a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of the investigations, including statements of support or opposition to the petition(s), on or before October 29, 2024. On November 12, 2024, the Commission will make available to parties all information on which they have not had an opportunity to comment. Parties may submit final comments on this information on or before November 14, 2024. The deadline for filing appearances is 21 days before the hearing.

For further information concerning this proceeding, see the Commission's notice cited above and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A and C (19 CFR part 207).

Authority: These investigations are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to § 207.21 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 8, 2024.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2024–18086 Filed 8–13–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Robert Rowen, M.D.; Decision and Order

On May 23, 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Robert Rowen M.D. (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certification of Registration No. AR9231919 at the registered address of 2200 County Center Dr., Ste. C, Santa Rosa, CA 95403. *Id.* at 1. The OSC alleged that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is ''currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of California, the state in which [he is] is registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).[1]

The OSC notified Registrant of his right to file with DEA a written request for hearing, and that if he failed to file such a request, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 2.[2] ''A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the registrant's/applicant's right to a hearing and an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC].'' 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

Further, ''[i]n the event that a registrant . . . is deemed to be in default . . . DEA may then file a request for final agency action with the Administrator, along with a record to support its request. In such circumstances, the Administrator may enter a default final order pursuant to [21 CFR] § 1316.67.'' *Id.* § 1301.43(f)(1). Here, the Government has requested final agency action based on Registrant's default pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(c), (f), 1301.46. RFAA, at 1; *see also* 21 CFR 1316.67.

Findings of Fact

The Agency finds that, in light of Registrant's default, the factual allegations in the OSC are admitted. According to the OSC, effective September 1, 2022, the Medical Board of California suspended Registrant's California medical license. RFAAX 1, at 1. According to California online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's California medical license has since been revoked.[3] California DCA License Search, *https://search.dca.ca.gov* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in California, the state in which he is registered with DEA.

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under 21 U.S.C. 823 ''upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license or registration suspended . . . [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances.'' With respect to a practitioner, DEA has also long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner's registration. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, D.O.,* 76 FR 71371, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied,* 481 F. App'x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, D.O.,* 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).[4]

According to California statute, ''dispense'' means ''to deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user or research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including the prescribing, furnishing, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for that delivery.'' Cal. Health & Safety Code section 11010

[1] According to Agency records, Registrant's registration expired on April 30, 2024. The fact that a registrant allows his registration to expire during the pendency of an OSC does not impact the Agency's jurisdiction or prerogative under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to adjudicate the OSC to finality. *Jeffrey D. Olsen, M.D.,* 84 FR 68474, 68476–79 (2019).

[2] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated October 16, 2023, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the submitted Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that Registrant was personally served with the OSC on May 24, 2023. RFAAX 2, at 1. The DI also stated in his Declaration that he personally witnessed Registrant sign and date a duplicate copy of the OSC to verify receipt. *Id.; see also id.* at 5.

[3] Under the Administrative Procedure Act, an agency ''may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision.'' United States Department of Justice, Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), ''[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary.'' Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's finding by filing a properly supported motion for reconsideration of findings of fact within fifteen calendar days of the date of this Order. Any such motion and response shall be filed and served by email to the other party and to the DEA Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration at *dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.*

[4] This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the CSA. First, Congress defined the term ''practitioner'' to mean ''a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . , to distribute, dispense, . . . [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.'' 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner's registration, Congress directed that ''[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.'' 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the CSA, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner's registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper,* 76 FR 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, D.O.,* 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, D.O.,* 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, D.O.,* 53 FR 11919, 11120 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton,* 43 FR 27617.

(West 2024). Further, a ''practitioner'' means a person ''licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, or administer, a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research in [the] state.'' *Id.* section 11026(c).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in California. As discussed above, a physician must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in California. Thus, because Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in California and, therefore, is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in California, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. Accordingly, the Agency will order that Registrant's DEA registration be revoked.

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. AR9231919 issued to Robert Rowen, M.D. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny any pending applications of Robert Rowen, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Robert Rowen, M.D., for additional registration in California. This Order is effective September 13, 2024.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on August 8, 2024, by Administrator Anne Milgram. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by DEA. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DEA Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to sign and submit the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of DEA. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Heather Achbach,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 2024–18095 Filed 8–13–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Irene Kimura, M.D.; Decision and Order

On July 12, 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Irene Kimura, M.D. (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 3, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. BK4376112 at the registered address of 1017 W Broadway Ave., Moses Lake, WA 98837. *Id.* at 1. The OSC alleged that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is ''currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Washington, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of her right to file with DEA a written request for hearing, and that if she failed to file such a request, she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 3.[1] ''A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the [registrant's] right to a hearing and an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC].'' 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

Further, ''[i]n the event that a registrant . . . is deemed to be in default . . . DEA may then file a request for final agency action with the Administrator, along with a record to support its request. In such circumstances, the Administrator may enter a default final order pursuant to [21 CFR] § 1316.67.'' *Id.* § 1301.43(f)(1). Here, the Government has requested final agency action based on Registrant's default pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(c), (f), 1301.46. RFAA, at 1; *see also* 21 CFR 1316.67.

Findings of Fact

The Agency finds that, in light of Registrant's default, the factual allegations in the OSC are admitted. According to the OSC, on or about November 9, 2021, the State of Washington Department of Health Washington Medical Commission issued an ''Ex Parte Order of Summary Action—Restriction'' that restricted Registrant from prescribing controlled substances. RFAAX 3, at 2. According to Washington's online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's Washington medical license is revoked.[2] Washington State Department of Health Provider Credential Search, *https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/providercredentialsearch/* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Washington, the state in which she is registered with DEA.

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under 21 U.S.C. 823 ''upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license or registration suspended . . . [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances.'' With respect to a practitioner, DEA has also long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner's registration. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, D.O.,* 76 FR 71371, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied,* 481 F. App'x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, D.O.,* 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).[3]

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated October 6, 2023, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the included email chain from a DEA Diversion Investigator to Registrant indicates that Registrant was successfully served with the OSC by email on July 17, 2023. RFAAX 2, at 1–2.

[2] Under the Administrative Procedure Act, an agency ''may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision.'' United States Department of Justice, Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), ''[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary.'' Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's finding by filing a properly supported motion for reconsideration of findings of fact within fifteen calendar days of the date of this Order. Any such motion and response shall be filed and served by email to the other party and to the DEA Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration at *dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.*

[3] This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA). First, Congress defined the term ''practitioner'' to mean ''a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . , to distribute, dispense, . . . [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.'' 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner's registration, Congress directed that ''[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.'' 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress